

Violation of time symmetry

Koji Nagata
Department of Physics,
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,
Taejon 305-701, Korea
E-mail:nagata@kaist.ac.kr
TEL:+82-42-869-2596
FAX:+82-42-869-2510

Abstract

Recently, [arXiv:0810.3134] is accepted and published. We would like to study the relation between a local realistic theory and commutativity of observables in a finite-dimensional space. We would like to conjecture that a realistic theory of the Bell type (a local realistic theory) for events would not imply the commutative algebraic structure into the set of all observables if all experimental events would be reproduced by a local realistic theory. We would like to suggest that a violation of Bell locality would be derived within a realistic theory of the Kochen-Specker type within quantum events.

Keywords: The quantum theory, A local realistic theory

1 Introduction

Recently, [1] is accepted and published. As is well known, quantum observables do not commute generally in the Hilbert space formalism of the quantum theory [2, 3]. It is one of nonclassical features of the quantum theory. It may be said as noncommutativity. The equivalence between noncommutativity and the Kochen-Specker (KS) theorem [4] is shown in Refs. [5, 6].

Other nonclassical feature of the quantum theory is a violation of Bell locality [7]. It may be said as Bell nonlocality. This feature is derived by the inner product machinery of the Hilbert space [8]. The norm of Hermitian operators is generated by the inner product. A set of inner products violates the inequalities imposed by Bell locality. Similar situation occurs when entanglement witness inequalities are violated by a set of inner products. In this case, the inequalities are derived by the assumption that the system is described by separable states. We see that both (entanglement and Bell nonlocality) of the mathematical derivation have similar machinery in the Hilbert space formalism of the quantum theory.

It is shown that several pure entangled states must violate some Bell inequality [9, 10, 11]. There is an entangled mixed state which satisfies all Bell inequalities (cf. Ref. [12]). Such a state should violate some entanglement witness inequalities. There is a pure entangled state in the mixture of pure states constituting such a mixed state if the mixed state in question is an entangled state. Otherwise, the mixed state is written as a convex sum over separable states. We can see that the notion of entanglement of a mixed state is closely related with the notion of Bell nonlocality and directly with entanglement witnesses.

It is discussed at length that entanglement is one of reasons why various quantum information processes are possible [13, 14].

It is suggested [15] that a violation of a Bell inequality implies noncommutativity. It is conjectured that the converse proposition is also true via the existence of joint distributions. ‘Joint distributions are well defined only for commuting observables’ [16]. This seems reasonable.

It is also suggested [17, 18] that all quantum observables would commute simultaneously if we would accept a realistic theory of the Bell type for quantum events, provided that all quantum events, including every quantum state and every observable (including every projector), would be reproduced by a realistic theory of the Bell type for quantum events. It seems that this indeed provides very important location that we should discuss about this open problem.

In this paper, we would like to study the relation between a local realistic theory and commutativity of observables in a finite-dimensional space. We would like to conjecture that a realistic theory of the Bell type (a local realistic theory) for events would not imply the commutative algebraic structure into the set of all observables if all experimental events would be reproduced by a local realistic theory. And we would like to suggest that a violation of Bell locality would be derived within a realistic theory of the KS type within quantum events.

We would like to hope that our discussion might provide further information for people who further consider the open problem.

Our thesis is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we would like to provide notation and preparations for this paper. In Sec. 3, we would like to review the Bell theorem. In Sec. 4, we would like to study a theorem concerning the relation

between a local realistic theory and commutativity of observables. In Sec. 5, we would like to study the relation between the Bell theorem and commutativity of observables. In Sec. 6, we would like to suggest that a violation of Bell locality would be derived within a realistic theory of the KS type within quantum events. Section 7 concludes this paper.

2 Notation and preparations

We consider a finite-dimensional space H . Let $\mathbf{R}$ denote the reals where $\pm\infty \notin \mathbf{R}$. We assume that every result of measurements lies in $\mathbf{R}$. We assume that every time t lies in $\mathbf{R}$. Let O be the set of all observables in a space H . Let T be the set of all states in the space H . We define a notation $\theta(t)$ which represents one result of measurements in a time t . We assume that measurement of an observable A in a time t for a physical system in a state $\psi(t)$ yields a value $\theta(A, t) \in \mathbf{R}$. We define Δ as any subset of the reals $\mathbf{R}$. We define $\chi_\Delta(x)$, ($x \in \mathbf{R}$) as the characteristic function. We assume that there is a classical probability space. It is written as $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu_{\psi(t)})$. Ω is a nonempty space. Σ is a σ -algebra of subsets of Ω . $\mu_{\psi(t)}$ is a σ -additive normalized measure on Σ such that $\mu_{\psi(t)}(\Omega) = 1$. The letter written as subscript $\psi(t)$ means that the probability measure is determined uniquely when a state $\psi(t)$ is specified.

We introduce measurable functions (classical random variables) onto Ω ($f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbf{R}$). The measurable function is written as $f_A(\omega_t)$ for an observable $A \in O$. Here $\omega_t \in \Omega$ is an element with respect to a time t . Let S be $\{\pm 1\}$.

We would like to consider the following propositions:

Proposition: R (*a realistic interpretation of a physical theory*),

A measurable function $f_A(\omega_t)$ exists for every observable A in O and for every time t .

Proposition: D (*the probability distribution rule*),

$$\mu_{\psi(t)}(f_A^{-1}(\Delta)) = \text{Prob}(\Delta)_{\theta(A, t)}^{\psi(t)}. \quad (2.1)$$

The symbol $(\Delta)_{\theta(A, t)}^{\psi(t)}$ denotes the following proposition: $\theta(A, t)$ lies in Δ if the system is described by a state $\psi(t)$. The symbol “Prob” denotes the probability that the proposition $(\Delta)_{\theta(A, t)}^{\psi(t)}$ holds.

Proposition: L (*the Bell locality*),

$$\omega_{t_1} = \omega_{t_2} = \omega_t \quad (2.2)$$

for $t_1 \neq t_2$.

Proposition: M (*measurement outcome*),

$$f_A(\omega_t) \in S. \quad (2.3)$$

We would like to review the following:

Lemma:[19] If

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{\psi(t), A\}\| &:= \sum_{y \in S} \text{Prob}(\{y\})_{\theta(A, t)}^{\psi(t)} y, \\ E_{\psi(t)}(A) &:= \int_{\omega_t \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t)}(d\omega_t) f_A(\omega_t), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$R \wedge D \wedge M \Rightarrow \|\{\psi(t), A\}\| = E_{\psi(t)}(A). \quad (2.4)$$

Proof: Note

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_t \in f_A^{-1}(\{y\}) &\Leftrightarrow f_A(\omega_t) \in \{y\} \Leftrightarrow y = f_A(\omega_t), \\ \int_{\omega_t \in f_A^{-1}(\{y\})} \frac{\mu_{\psi(t)}(d\omega_t)}{\mu_{\psi(t)}(f_A^{-1}(\{y\}))} &= 1, \\ y \neq y' &\Rightarrow f_A^{-1}(\{y\}) \cap f_A^{-1}(\{y'\}) = \emptyset. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\{\psi(t), A\}\| &= \sum_{y \in S} \text{Prob}(\{y\})_{\theta(A,t)}^{\psi(t)} y = \sum_{y \in \mathbf{R}} \text{Prob}(\{y\})_{\theta(A,t)}^{\psi(t)} y \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbf{R}} \mu_{\psi(t)}(f_A^{-1}(\{y\})) y \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbf{R}} \mu_{\psi(t)}(f_A^{-1}(\{y\})) y \times \int_{\omega_t \in f_A^{-1}(\{y\})} \frac{\mu_{\psi(t)}(d\omega_t)}{\mu_{\psi(t)}(f_A^{-1}(\{y\}))} \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathbf{R}} \int_{\omega_t \in f_A^{-1}(\{y\})} \mu_{\psi(t)}(f_A^{-1}(\{y\})) \times \frac{\mu_{\psi(t)}(d\omega_t)}{\mu_{\psi(t)}(f_A^{-1}(\{y\}))} f_A(\omega_t) \\ &= \int_{\omega_t \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t)}(d\omega_t) f_A(\omega_t) = E_{\psi(t)}(A). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

QED.

The probability measure $\mu_{\psi(t)}$ may be chosen such that the following equation would be valid if we assign the truth value “1” for Proposition R, Proposition D, and Proposition M, simultaneously:

$$\|\{\psi(t), A\}\| = \int_{\omega_t \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t)}(d\omega_t) f_A(\omega_t) \quad (2.7)$$

for every observable A in O .

Definition: (an observable with respect to commutator),

$$F(A, B) := |[A, B]|^2 \quad (2.8)$$

for every pair of observables A and B .

3 The Bell theorem

In this section, we would like to review the Bell theorem:

Theorem: (the Bell inequality),

$$\begin{aligned} R \wedge D \wedge L \wedge M \\ \Rightarrow \|\{\psi(t), \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2\}\| - \|\{\psi(t), \sigma_x^1 \sigma_y^2\}\| + \|\{\psi(t), \sigma_y^1 \sigma_x^2\}\| + \|\{\psi(t), \sigma_y^1 \sigma_y^2\}\| \leq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Proof: Let x, y be real numbers with $x, y \in S$. Then we have

$$(xx - xy + yx + yy) = \pm 2. \quad (3.2)$$

Proposition R and Proposition M imply

$$f_{\sigma_x^1}(\omega_{t_1}) = \pm 1, f_{\sigma_y^1}(\omega_{t_2}) = \pm 1, f_{\sigma_x^2}(\omega_{t_1}) = \pm 1, f_{\sigma_y^2}(\omega_{t_2}) = \pm 1. \quad (3.3)$$

Hence the condition (3.2) implies

$$\begin{aligned} U(\omega_{t_1}, \omega_{t_2}) &:= f_{\sigma_x^1}(\omega_{t_1})f_{\sigma_x^2}(\omega_{t_1}) - f_{\sigma_x^1}(\omega_{t_1})f_{\sigma_y^2}(\omega_{t_2}) + f_{\sigma_y^1}(\omega_{t_2})f_{\sigma_x^2}(\omega_{t_1}) + f_{\sigma_y^1}(\omega_{t_2})f_{\sigma_y^2}(\omega_{t_2}) \\ &\Rightarrow U(\omega_{t_1}, \omega_{t_2}) = \pm 2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Proposition L implies $U(\omega_{t_1}, \omega_{t_2}) = U(\omega_t, \omega_t)$. Thus,

$$U(\omega_t, \omega_t) = f_{\sigma_x^1}(\omega_t)f_{\sigma_x^2}(\omega_t) - f_{\sigma_x^1}(\omega_t)f_{\sigma_y^2}(\omega_t) + f_{\sigma_y^1}(\omega_t)f_{\sigma_x^2}(\omega_t) + f_{\sigma_y^1}(\omega_t)f_{\sigma_y^2}(\omega_t) = \pm 2. \quad (3.5)$$

We define $V(\omega_t)$ as $V(\omega_t) := U(\omega_t, \omega_t)$. We see the following implication:

$$\begin{aligned} V(\omega_t) &= f_{\sigma_x^1}(\omega_t)f_{\sigma_x^2}(\omega_t) - f_{\sigma_x^1}(\omega_t)f_{\sigma_y^2}(\omega_t) + f_{\sigma_y^1}(\omega_t)f_{\sigma_x^2}(\omega_t) + f_{\sigma_y^1}(\omega_t)f_{\sigma_y^2}(\omega_t) \\ &\Rightarrow V(\omega_t) = \pm 2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Hence we have

$$\int_{\omega_t \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t)}(d\omega_t) V(\omega_t) \leq 2. \quad (3.7)$$

Proposition R, Proposition D, and Proposition M imply (cf. (2.4).)

$$\|\{\psi(t), \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2\}\| - \|\{\psi(t), \sigma_x^1 \sigma_y^2\}\| + \|\{\psi(t), \sigma_y^1 \sigma_x^2\}\| + \|\{\psi(t), \sigma_y^1 \sigma_y^2\}\| \leq 2. \quad (3.8)$$

QED.

A violation of the inequality (3.8) implies that we cannot assign the truth value “1” for Proposition R, Proposition D, Proposition L, and Proposition M, simultaneously, in a state $\psi(t)$.

In what follows, we would like to accept the quantum theory. We may assume that $\|\{\psi(t), A\}\| = \text{tr}[\psi(t)A]$ for every $A \in O$.

Let $\psi(t)$ be

$$\psi(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|+1\rangle|+2\rangle + e^{i\pi/4}|-1\rangle|-2\rangle). \quad (3.9)$$

We may assume that

$$\text{tr}[\psi(t)\sigma_x^1\sigma_x^2] + \text{tr}[\psi(t)\sigma_y^1\sigma_y^2] = \sqrt{2}, \quad -\text{tr}[\psi(t)\sigma_x^1\sigma_y^2] + \text{tr}[\psi(t)\sigma_y^1\sigma_x^2] = \sqrt{2}. \quad (3.10)$$

Then we have

$$\text{tr}[\psi(t)\sigma_x^1\sigma_x^2] - \text{tr}[\psi(t)\sigma_x^1\sigma_y^2] + \text{tr}[\psi(t)\sigma_y^1\sigma_x^2] + \text{tr}[\psi(t)\sigma_y^1\sigma_y^2] = 2\sqrt{2}. \quad (3.11)$$

Therefore the Bell theorem would be true if we would accept the quantum theory.

4 A local realistic commuting observables theory

In this section, we would like to study the following theorem:

Theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : \\ & [\mathbf{R} \wedge \mathbf{D} \wedge \mathbf{L} \wedge \mathbf{M} \wedge [\|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0]] \Rightarrow \perp. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Proof: Proposition R, Proposition D, and Proposition M imply

$$\|\{\psi(t_1), F(A, B)\}\| = \int_{\omega_{t_1} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_1)}(d\omega_{t_1}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_1}) \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\|\{\psi(t_2), F(A, B)\}\| = \int_{\omega_{t_2} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_2)}(d\omega_{t_2}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_2}). \quad (4.3)$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\{\psi(t_1), F(A, B)\}\| \cdot \|\{\psi(t_2), F(A, B)\}\| \\ &= \int_{\omega_{t_1} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_1)}(d\omega_{t_1}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_1}) \int_{\omega_{t_2} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_2)}(d\omega_{t_2}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_2}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Proposition $\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : [\|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0]$ implies that the left-hand-side of (4.4) is 0. We derive the following proposition:

$$\|\{\psi(t_1), F(A, B)\}\| \cdot \|\{\psi(t_2), F(A, B)\}\| = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

On the other hand, Proposition M implies that the right-hand-side of (4.4) is as

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\omega_{t_1} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_1)}(d\omega_{t_1}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_1}) \int_{\omega_{t_2} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_2)}(d\omega_{t_2}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_2}) \\ &= \int_{\omega_{t_1} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_1)}(d\omega_{t_1}) \int_{\omega_{t_2} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_2)}(d\omega_{t_2}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_1}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_2}) \\ &\leq \int_{\omega_{t_1} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_1)}(d\omega_{t_1}) \int_{\omega_{t_2} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_2)}(d\omega_{t_2}) |f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_1}) f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_2})| \\ &= \int_{\omega_{t_1} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_1)}(d\omega_{t_1}) \int_{\omega_{t_2} \in \Omega} \mu_{\psi(t_2)}(d\omega_{t_2}) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

We use the following fact

$$|f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_1}) \cdot f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_2})| = 1. \quad (4.7)$$

Proposition L implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\omega_{t_1} | \omega_{t_1} \in \Omega \wedge f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_1}) = 1\} = \{\omega_{t_2} | \omega_{t_2} \in \Omega \wedge f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_2}) = 1\}, \\ & \{\omega_{t_1} | \omega_{t_1} \in \Omega \wedge f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_1}) = -1\} = \{\omega_{t_2} | \omega_{t_2} \in \Omega \wedge f_{F(A, B)}(\omega_{t_2}) = -1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

The inequality (4.6) is saturated since

$$\begin{aligned} \{\omega_{t_1} | \omega_{t_1} \in \Omega \wedge f_{F(A,B)}(\omega_{t_1}) = 1\} &= \{\omega_{t_2} | \omega_{t_2} \in \Omega \wedge f_{F(A,B)}(\omega_{t_2}) = 1\}, \\ \{\omega_{t_1} | \omega_{t_1} \in \Omega \wedge f_{F(A,B)}(\omega_{t_1}) = -1\} &= \{\omega_{t_2} | \omega_{t_2} \in \Omega \wedge f_{F(A,B)}(\omega_{t_2}) = -1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Hence we derive the following proposition if we assign the truth value “1” for Proposition R, Proposition D, Proposition L, and Proposition M, simultaneously

$$\|\{\psi(t_1), F(A, B)\}\| \cdot \|\{\psi(t_2), F(A, B)\}\| = 1. \quad (4.10)$$

We do not assign the truth value “1” for two propositions (4.5) and (4.10), simultaneously. We are in the contradiction.

We do not accept the following five propositions, simultaneously.

1. Proposition R
2. Proposition D
3. Proposition L
4. Proposition M
5. $\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : [\|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0]$.

This is true for every time t , every state $\psi(t)$, and every pair of observables A and B . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : \\ [\mathbf{R} \wedge \mathbf{D} \wedge \mathbf{L} \wedge \mathbf{M} \wedge [\|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0]] \Rightarrow \perp. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

QED.

5 Algebraic structure of observables and a local realistic theory

In this section, we would like to infer main suggestion of this paper.

Let $B(\psi(t))$ be the symbol of the following proposition:

Proposition: $B(\psi(t))$

Proposition R, Proposition D, Proposition L, and Proposition M hold when the system is described by a state $\psi(t)$ in a time t .

5.1 The Bell theorem and a commuting observables theory

We might consider the following proposition:

Proposition: C (*a local realistic theory implies commutativity of all observables*),

A local realistic theory for all experimental events implies that an observable $F(A, B)$ is $\mathbf{0}$, which represents the null observable, for every pair of observables A and B .

A	B	$A \vee B$
1	1	1
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	0

Table 1: Truth Value Table : A implies a proposition. B implies a proposition. $A \vee B$ implies a proposition of disjunction of A and B .

We would like to formulate Proposition C as the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : [B(\psi(t)) \Rightarrow \|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0]. \quad (5.1)$$

The proposition (5.1) would be equivalent to the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : [\overline{B(\psi(t))} \vee \|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0]. \quad (5.2)$$

Here, the upper bar is for complements.

5.1.1 Case 1

The Bell theorem is consistent with the negation of Proposition C as shown below.

If we assign the truth value “1” for the Bell theorem and we assign the truth value “0” for Proposition C, then we have to assign the truth value “0” for the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T : \overline{B(\psi(t))}. \quad (5.3)$$

From Truth Value Table 1 and the fact that we assign the truth value “0” for Proposition C, we have to assign the truth value “0” for the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : \|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0. \quad (5.4)$$

From Truth Value Table 1, we have to assign the truth value “0” for the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : [\overline{B(\psi(t))} \vee [\|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0]]. \quad (5.5)$$

Hence, we might say the following proposition:

Proposition 1:

The truth value for the following proposition is “1”:

$$[\text{the Bell theorem}] \wedge \overline{\text{Proposition C}}. \quad (5.6)$$

Hence we would establish the desired consistency.

5.1.2 Case 2

The negation of the Bell theorem is consistent with Proposition C as shown below.

If we assign the truth value “0” for the Bell theorem and we assign the truth value “1” for Proposition C, then we have to assign the truth value “1” for the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T : \overline{B(\psi(t))}. \quad (5.7)$$

From Truth Value Table 1 and the fact that we assign the truth value “1” for Proposition C, we may assign the truth value “0” or “1” for the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : \|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0. \quad (5.8)$$

From Truth Value Table 1, we have to assign the truth value “1” for the following proposition:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : \\ &\left[\overline{B(\psi(t))} \vee [\|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Hence, we might say the following proposition:

Proposition 2:

The truth value for the following proposition is “1”:

$$\left[\overline{\text{the Bell theorem}} \right] \wedge \text{Proposition C}. \quad (5.10)$$

Hence we would establish the desired consistency.

5.1.3 Case 3

The Bell theorem is consistent with Proposition C as shown below.

If we assign the truth value “1” for the Bell theorem and we assign the truth value “1” for Proposition C, then we have to assign the truth value “0” for the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T : \overline{B(\psi(t))}. \quad (5.11)$$

From Truth Value Table 1 and the fact that we assign the truth value “1” for Proposition C, we have to assign the truth value “1” for the following proposition:

$$\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : \|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0. \quad (5.12)$$

From Truth Value Table 1, we have to assign the truth value “1” for the following proposition:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \forall \psi(t) \in T, \forall A, B \in O : \\ &\left[\overline{B(\psi(t))} \vee [\|\{\psi(t), F(A, B)\}\| = 0] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Hence, we might say the following proposition:

Proposition 3:

The truth value for the following proposition is “1”:

$$[\text{the Bell theorem}] \wedge \text{Proposition C.} \quad (5.14)$$

Hence we would establish the desired consistency.

5.2 Conjecture

Thinking of and estimating the validity of the Bell theorem that would be either correct or not, we might suggest the following statement:

Conjecture: *We conjecture that a realistic theory of the Bell type (a local realistic theory) for events would not imply the commutative algebraic structure into the set of all observables if all experimental events would be reproduced by a local realistic theory.*

6 Bell locality and a realistic theory of the Kochen-Specker type

In this section, it would be suggested that a violation of Bell locality (Bell locality is defined by Proposition L) would be derived within a realistic theory of the Kochen-Specker (KS) type for quantum events. A violation of Bell locality is as

$$\omega_{t_1} \neq \omega_{t_2} \quad (6.1)$$

for $t_1 \neq t_2$.

It is suggested [19] that a realistic theory of the Bell type ($\omega_{t_1} = \omega_{t_2}$) would violate a realistic theory of the KS type (noncommutativity would appear) in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space formalism of the quantum theory. An inequality valid for the KS condition for a finite number of observables is used. The quantum predictions produced by an uncorrelated pure state would violate the inequality (within a finite-dimensional space).

It is suggested [20] that a violation of some entanglement witness inequality would imply noncommutativity (within a finite-dimensional space).

We might consider that a violation of some inequality would imply noncommutativity. This conjecture might be true. If so, we might ask by what origin such an inequality is derived is.

By the way, we would like to review the functional rule (the KS condition). Let g be any function. Let v be $v \in O$. The functional rule is

$$g(f_v(\omega_t)) = f_{g(v)}(\omega_t) \quad (6.2)$$

for every $t \in \mathbf{R}$. If we would accept the condition (6.2), all quantum observables in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space H would commute simultaneously.

The inequality in question would be originated from

1. the functional rule (the KS condition)

2. the quantum relation $\sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2 = -\sigma_y^1 \sigma_y^2 \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2$

since the discussion of the inequality in Ref. [19] uses these conditions. This might be reasonable in the following sense: ‘A violation of an inequality derived by commutative condition implies noncommutativity’.

We notice Peres no-go theorem [21]. We see that the inequality in question relies on Peres no-go theorem. There is an elegant key in Peres no-go theorem, which suggests a violation of Bell locality within a realistic theory of the KS type.

We would like to fix the value as $f_{\sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2}(\omega_t) = \zeta(\pm 1)$ in two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ particles in any quantum state for every $t \in \mathbf{R}$. Then the values of $f_{\sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2}(\omega_t)$ and $f_{\sigma_y^1 \sigma_y^2}(\omega_t)$ are necessarily entangled each other in the sense that the value of one of them is immediately determined when we assign a value to other.

It would be thinkable that such an entanglement would have nothing to do with the validity of a violation of Bell locality ($\omega_{t_1} \neq \omega_{t_2}$). We would like to assume the validity of a violation of Bell locality ($\omega_{t_1} \neq \omega_{t_2}$). Then the values of $f_{\sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2}(\omega_{t_1})$, $f_{\sigma_y^1 \sigma_y^2}(\omega_{t_1})$, and $f_{\sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2}(\omega_{t_1})$ are independent of each other. The values of $f_{\sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2}(\omega_{t_2})$, $f_{\sigma_y^1 \sigma_y^2}(\omega_{t_2})$, and $f_{\sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2}(\omega_{t_2})$ are also independent of each other.

We might call such an entanglement as *the KS nonlocality*. The KS nonlocality of value assignment appears when we would like to accept the KS condition in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space. The KS nonlocality depends on algebraic structure of observables. The KS nonlocality is independent of the state of the system under study. The KS nonlocality is independent of time t .

In contrast, Bell nonlocality ($\omega_{t_1} \neq \omega_{t_2}$) itself would not certify such a nonlocality of value assignment. Bell nonlocality does not depend on algebraic structure of observables. Bell nonlocality depends on the state of the system. Bell nonlocality depends on time t .

We would like to hope that our discussion might infer an example which suggests a violation of Bell locality (a violation of classical algebraic structure (physically speaking, a violation of time symmetry)) within a realistic theory of the KS type (classical algebraic structure (physically speaking, Newton’s theory)).

7 Conclusions

In conclusion, we have studied the relation between a local realistic theory and commutativity of observables in a finite-dimensional space. We have conjectured that a realistic theory of the Bell type (a local realistic theory) for events would not imply the commutative algebraic structure into the set of all observables if all experimental events would be reproduced by a local realistic theory. We have suggested that a violation of Bell locality would be derived within a realistic theory of the Kochen-Specker type within quantum events.

We would like to hope that our discussion might provide further information for people who further consider the open problem.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Professor Marek Żukowski for valuable discussions. The author would like to acknowledge Professor Tadao Nakamura for his helpful much education. This work has been supported by Frontier Basic Research Programs at KAIST and K.N. is supported by a BK21 research grant.

References

- [1] K. Nagata and T. Nakamura, arXiv:0810.3134.
- [2] M. Redhead, *Incompleteness, Nonlocality, and Realism*, 2nd ed. (Clarendon, Oxford, 1989),
- [3] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1993).
- [4] S. Kochen and E. P. Specker, J. Math. Mech. **17**, 59 (1967).
- [5] J. D. Malley, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022118 (2004).
- [6] J. D. Malley, arXiv:quant-ph/0402126.
- [7] J. S. Bell, Physics (Long Island City, N.Y.) **1**, 195 (1964).
- [8] M. Żukowski, Phys. Lett. A **177**, 290 (1993).
- [9] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **154**, 201 (1991).
- [10] M. Żukowski, Č. Brukner, W. Laskowski, and M. Wieśniak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 210402 (2002)
- [11] W. Laskowski, T. Paterek, M. Żukowski, and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 200401 (2004).
- [12] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [13] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [14] A. Galindo and M. A. Martín-Delgado, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 347 (2002).
- [15] A. Fine, J. Math. Phys. **23**, 1306 (1982).
- [16] A. Fine, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 291 (1982).
- [17] J. D. Malley and A. Fine, Phys. Lett. A **347**, 51 (2005).
- [18] J. D. Malley and A. Fine, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 066102 (2006).
- [19] K. Nagata, J. Math. Phys. **46**, 102101 (2005).
- [20] K. Nagata, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012325 (2005).
- [21] A. Peres, Phys. Lett. A **151**, 107 (1990).